



Sharp growth and distortion theorems for a subclass of biholomorphic mappings[☆]

Qing-Hua Xu^{a,*}, Tai-Shun Liu^b

^a College of Mathematics and Information Science, Jiangxi Normal University, NanChang 330027, China

^b Department of Mathematics, Huzhou Teacher's College, Huzhou 313000, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 August 2009

Received in revised form 7 April 2010

Accepted 7 April 2010

Keywords:

Growth

Distortion theorems

Subclass of starlike mappings

ABSTRACT

Let X be a complex Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|$, and B be the unit ball in X . In this paper, we introduce a class of holomorphic mappings \mathcal{M}_g on B . Let $F(x)$ be a normalized locally biholomorphic mapping on B such that $(DF(x))^{-1}F(x) \in \mathcal{M}_g$. We investigate the sharp growth theorem for $F(x)$. As applications, the sharp distortion theorems for a subclass of starlike mappings are obtained.

Crown Copyright © 2010 Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In the case of one complex variable, the following growth and distortion theorem is well-known [1].

Theorem A. *Let f be a normalized univalent holomorphic function on the unit disc D in \mathbb{C} . Then*

$$\frac{|z|}{(1+|z|)^2} \leq |f(z)| \leq \frac{|z|}{(1-|z|)^2}, \quad z \in D, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{1-|z|}{(1+|z|)^3} \leq |f'(z)| \leq \frac{1+|z|}{(1-|z|)^3}, \quad z \in D. \quad (2)$$

However, in the case of several complex variables, Cartan [2] pointed out that the above theorem does not hold.

Barnard et al. [3] and Chuaqui [4] extended the growth theorem (1) to normalized starlike mappings on the Euclidean unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n . Subsequently, many mathematicians have investigated the growth theorem for the subclasses of starlike mappings [5–8].

Concerning the distortion theorem, the situation is quite different. Until now, the distortion theorem for the above mappings is still a conjecture. In [9], Pfaltzgraff and Suffridge obtained a distortion result for a subclass of starlike mappings on the Euclidean unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n .

In this paper, we shall obtain a sharp growth theorem for a class of biholomorphic mappings. From it, the sharp distortion theorems for a subclass of starlike mappings are obtained. These results are generalizations of the above results.

[☆] This work was supported by the Key Project of Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. D7080080), the Jiangxi Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 2007GZ50177), Natural Science Foundation of Department of Education of Jiangxi Province, China (Grant No. GJJ 09149) and Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Jiangxi Normal University.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: xuqh@mail.ustc.edu.cn (Q.-H. Xu), Its@ustc.edu.cn (T.-S. Liu).

Let X be a complex Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|$, X^* be the dual space of X , B be the unit ball in X , and D be the unit disc in \mathbb{C} . For each $x \in X \setminus \{0\}$, we define $T(x) = \{l_x \in X^* : \|l_x\| \leq 1, l_x(x) = \|x\|\}$. According to the Hahn–Banach theorem, $T(x)$ is nonempty. Let $H(B)$ be the set of all holomorphic mappings from B into X . Notice that, for fixed $x \in X$, $\forall \alpha (\neq 0) \in \mathbb{C}$, when l_x is chosen and fixed, then $\|\frac{|\alpha|}{\alpha} l_x\| = \|l_x\| \leq 1$, and $\frac{|\alpha|}{\alpha} l_x(\alpha x) = \frac{|\alpha|}{\alpha} \alpha l_x(x) = |\alpha| \|x\| = \|\alpha x\|$, so we can set $l_{\alpha x} = \frac{|\alpha|}{\alpha} l_x$. A holomorphic mapping $f : B \rightarrow X$ is said to be biholomorphic if the inverse f^{-1} exists and is holomorphic on the open set $f(B)$. A mapping $f \in H(B)$ is said to be locally biholomorphic if the Fréchet derivative $Df(x)$ has a bounded inverse for each $x \in B$. We say that f is normalized if $f(0) = 0$ and $Df(0) = I$, where I represents the identity operator from X into X . Let $S(B)$ be the set of all normalized biholomorphic mappings. We say that f is starlike if f is biholomorphic on B and $f(B)$ is starlike with respect to the origin. Let $S^*(B)$ be the set of normalized starlike mappings on B . When $B = D$, the set $S^*(D)$ is denoted by S^* .

Definition 1. Let $g \in H(D)$ be a biholomorphic function such that $g(0) = 1$, $g(\bar{\xi}) = \overline{g(\xi)}$, for $\xi \in D$, $\Re g(\xi) > 0$ on $\xi \in D$, and assume that g satisfies the following conditions for $r \in (0, 1)$:

$$\begin{cases} \min_{|\xi|=r} |g(\xi)| = \min_{|\xi|=r} \Re g(\xi) = g(-r) \\ \max_{|\xi|=r} |g(\xi)| = \max_{|\xi|=r} \Re g(\xi) = g(r). \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We define \mathcal{M}_g to be the class of mappings given by

$$\mathcal{M}_g = \left\{ p \in H(B) : p(0) = 0, Dp(0) = I, \frac{\|x\|}{l_x(p(x))} \in g(D), x \in B \setminus \{0\}, l_x \in T(x) \right\}.$$

Definition 1 was considered by Kohr [10] on B^n and by Graham et al. [11] on the unit ball with respect to an arbitrary norm on \mathbb{C}^n . The set \mathcal{M}_g has been important in the study of certain problems related to Löwner chains on the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n (see [12]).

Let $S_g^*(B)$ denote the subset of $S^*(B)$ consisting of those normalized locally biholomorphic mappings f such that $[Df(x)]^{-1}f(x) \in \mathcal{M}_g$. When $B = D$, the set $S_g^*(D)$ is denoted by S_g^* .

Definition 2. Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. A normalized locally biholomorphic mapping $f \in H(B)$ is said to be starlike of order α if

$$[Df(x)]^{-1}f(x) \in \mathcal{M}_g,$$

where $g(\zeta) = \frac{1+(2\alpha-1)\zeta}{1+\zeta}$, $\zeta \in D$.

We denote by $S_\alpha^*(B)$ the set of all starlike mappings of order α on B . When $B = D$, the set $S_\alpha^*(D)$ is denoted by S_α^* . The following theorem is about the distortion result for the class of S_α^* .

Theorem B. If $f \in S_\alpha^*$, then

$$\frac{1 - (1 - 2\alpha)|z|}{(1 + |z|)^{3-2\alpha}} \leq |f'(z)| \leq \frac{1 + (1 - 2\alpha)|z|}{(1 - |z|)^{3-2\alpha}}, \quad z \in D.$$

These estimates are sharp. Equality holds for $f(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2(1-\alpha)}}$, $z \in D$.

2. Preliminaries

In order to prove the desired results, we first give some lemmas.

Lemma 1 ([13]). Suppose that $x(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is differentiable at the point s which belongs to $[0, 1]$, and $\|x(t)\|$ is differentiable at the point s with respect to t . Then

$$\Re \left[T_{x(t)} \left(\frac{dx(t)}{dt} \right) \right] \Big|_{t=s} = \frac{d(\|x(t)\|)}{dt} \Big|_{t=s}.$$

Lemma 2 ([14]). Suppose that F is a starlike mapping on B , $x \in B \setminus \{0\}$, $x(t) = F^{-1}(tF(x))$ ($0 \leq t \leq 1$). Then

- (a) $\|x(t)\|$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$ with respect to t ;
- (b) $\|F(x)\| = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|x(t)\|}{t}$, $\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{t} [DF(x(t))]^{-1} F(x(t))$, $t \in (0, 1)$.

Lemma 3. If $h \in \mathcal{M}_g$, then

$$\frac{\|x\|}{g(\|x\|)} \leq \Re T_x(h(x)) \leq \frac{\|x\|}{g(-\|x\|)} \quad (4)$$

for all $x \in B$.

Proof. Fix $x \in B \setminus \{0\}$, and denote $x_0 = \frac{x}{\|x\|}$. Let $p : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by

$$p(\xi) = \begin{cases} \frac{\xi}{T_x(h(\xi x_0))}, & \xi \neq 0, \\ 1, & \xi = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $p \in H(D)$, $p(0) = g(0) = 1$, and since $h \in \mathcal{M}_g$, we deduce that

$$p(\xi) = \frac{\xi}{T_x(h(\xi x_0))} = \frac{\xi}{T_{x_0}(h(\xi x_0))} = \frac{\|\xi x_0\|}{T_{\xi x_0}(h(\xi x_0))} \in g(D), \quad \xi \in D.$$

Let $\psi(\xi) = \frac{1}{p(\xi)}$. This implies that $\psi(\xi) \in \frac{1}{g}(D)$ for all $\xi \in D$. Since $\psi(0) = \frac{1}{g}(0) = 1$, we have $\psi \prec \frac{1}{g}$, and from the subordination principle it follows that $\psi(rD) \subseteq \frac{1}{g}(rD)$, $r \in (0, 1)$, where $rD = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < r\}$. On the other hand, combining the maximum and minimum principles for harmonic functions with (3), we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{g(|\xi|)} \leq \Re \psi(\xi) \leq \frac{1}{g(-|\xi|)}, \quad \xi \in D.$$

Setting $\xi = \|x\|$ in the above relation, we obtain (4), as desired. This completes the proof. \square

3. Main results and their proofs

Theorem 1. Suppose that $f \in S$ and $F(x) = x \frac{f(l_u(x))}{l_u(x)}$, where u is the unit vector of X . Then $F \in S_g^*(B)$ if and only if $f \in S_g^*$.

Proof. Denote $h(x) = \frac{f(l_u(x))}{l_u(x)}$. Since $F(x) = h(x)x$, we have $DF(x)\eta = (Dh(x)\eta)x + h(x)\eta$, $\eta \in X$. Also, since $f \in S$, we obtain $\frac{f'(l_u(x))l_u(x)}{f(l_u(x))} \neq 0$, $x \in B$. Straightforward calculation shows that $\frac{Dh(x)x}{h(x)} = \frac{f'(l_u(x))l_u(x)}{f(l_u(x))} - 1$; hence $\frac{Dh(x)x}{h(x)} + 1 \neq 0$. It is not difficult to check that

$$(DF(x))^{-1}\eta = \frac{1}{h(x)} \left[\eta - \frac{(Dh(x)\eta)x}{h(x) + Dh(x)x} \right], \quad \eta \in X.$$

So F is a normalized locally biholomorphic mapping on B , and

$$(DF(x))^{-1}F(x) = \frac{1}{h(x)} \left[x - \frac{(Dh(x)x)x}{h(x) + Dh(x)x} \right] \frac{f(l_u(x))}{l_u(x)} = \frac{f(l_u(x))}{f'(l_u(x))l_u(x)} x. \quad (5)$$

From (5), we have

$$\frac{\|x\|}{l_x[(DF(x))^{-1}F(x)]} = \frac{f'(l_u(x))l_u(x)}{f(l_u(x))},$$

as desired. This completes the proof. \square

In [7], Hamada and Honda have recently obtained a sharp growth result for mappings in the family $S_{g, k+1}^*(B)$ for which $z = 0$ is a zero of order $k + 1$ for $f(z) - z$, and g satisfies a slightly different assumption than that in Definition 1. Stimulated by [7], we obtain the following sharp growth theorem.

Theorem 2. Let $F : B \rightarrow X$ be a normalized locally biholomorphic mapping. If $F \in S_g^*(B)$, then

$$\|x\| \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} [g(-y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y} \leq \|F(x)\| \leq \|x\| \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} [g(y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y}, \quad x \in B. \quad (6)$$

Proof. Since $F \in S_g^*(B)$, we deduce from Lemma 3 that

$$\frac{\|x\|}{g(\|x\|)} \leq \Re T_x(DF(x))^{-1}F(x) \leq \frac{\|x\|}{g(-\|x\|)} \quad (7)$$

for all $x \in B$. Fix $x \in B \setminus \{0\}$, let $x(t) = F^{-1}(tF(x))$ ($0 \leq t \leq 1$). According to (a) of Lemma 2, we obtain that $\|x(t)\|$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$. Hence, $\|x(t)\|$ is differentiable on $[0, 1]$ a.e. From Lemmas 1, 2(b) and (7), we deduce that, for $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\frac{\|x(t)\|}{g(\|x(t)\|)} \leq t \frac{d\|x(t)\|}{dt} \leq \frac{\|x(t)\|}{g(-\|x(t)\|)}, \quad (8)$$

and we may rewrite (8) as

$$\frac{g(-\|x(t)\|)}{\|x(t)\|} \frac{d\|x(t)\|}{dt} \leq \frac{1}{t} \leq \frac{g(\|x(t)\|)}{\|x(t)\|} \frac{d\|x(t)\|}{dt}.$$

Integrating both sides of the above inequalities with respect to t and making a change of variable, we obtain

$$\int_{\|x(\varepsilon)\|}^{\|x\|} \frac{g(-y)dy}{y} = \int_{\varepsilon}^1 \frac{g(-\|x(t)\|)}{\|x(t)\|} \frac{d\|x(t)\|}{dt} dt \leq \int_{\varepsilon}^1 \frac{1}{t} dt,$$

and

$$\int_{\|x(\varepsilon)\|}^{\|x\|} \frac{g(y)dy}{y} = \int_{\varepsilon}^1 \frac{g(\|x(t)\|)}{\|x(t)\|} \frac{d\|x(t)\|}{dt} dt \geq \int_{\varepsilon}^1 \frac{1}{t} dt,$$

where $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. It is elementary to verify that

$$\log \frac{\|x(\varepsilon)\|}{\varepsilon} \geq \int_{\|x(\varepsilon)\|}^{\|x\|} [g(-y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y} + \log \|x\|, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\log \frac{\|x(\varepsilon)\|}{\varepsilon} \leq \int_{\|x(\varepsilon)\|}^{\|x\|} [g(y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y} + \log \|x\|. \quad (10)$$

If we now let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+$ in the above inequalities (9), (10) and use Lemma 2(b), we have

$$\|x\| \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} [g(-y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y} \leq \|F(x)\| \leq \|x\| \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} [g(y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y}, \quad x \in B,$$

as claimed. This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Remark 1. The estimations of Theorem 2 are sharp. To see this, let $b \in S_g^*$ be defined by $b(0) = b'(0) - 1 = 0$ and

$$\frac{\xi b'(\xi)}{b(\xi)} = g(\xi), \quad \xi \in D. \quad (11)$$

Also, for $u \in \partial B$, let

$$F_u(x) = \frac{f(l_u(x))}{l_u(x)} x, \quad x \in B. \quad (12)$$

In view of Theorem 1, $F_u \in S_g^*(B)$. From (11), we obtain the following equivalent formulation of Theorem 2.

$$\exp \int_0^{\|x\|} \left[\frac{y \tilde{f}'(y)}{\tilde{f}(y)} - 1 \right] \frac{dy}{y} \leq \frac{\|F(x)\|}{\|x\|} \leq \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} \left[\frac{y f'(y)}{f(y)} - 1 \right] \frac{dy}{y}$$

for $x \in B$, where $\tilde{f}(\xi) = -f(-\xi)$. Then, we have

$$\exp \left[\log \frac{\tilde{f}(\|x\|)}{\|x\|} - \log \tilde{f}'(0) \right] \leq \frac{\|F(x)\|}{\|x\|} \leq \exp \left[\log \frac{f(\|x\|)}{\|x\|} - \log f(0) \right]$$

for $x \in B$, since $\tilde{f}(y), f(y) > 0$ for $y > 0$. We deduce that

$$-f(-\|x\|) \leq \|F(x)\| \leq f(\|x\|), \quad x \in B. \quad (13)$$

Next, we will show that the estimations (13) are sharp. Let $F_u \in S_g^*(B)$ be as in (12). Since $\|F_u(ru)\| = f(r)$ and $\|F_u(-ru)\| = |f(-r)|$, the equalities of the estimations (13) hold. The equivalence of (6) and (13) implies that the estimations (6) are sharp. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3. Let $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a convex function which satisfies the conditions of Definition 1. Suppose that $f_j \in S_g^*$, $\lambda_j \geq 0$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$. Then

$$F \in S_g^*(B),$$

where $F(x) = x \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(x))}{l_{u_j}(x)} \right)^{\lambda_j}$, $x \in B$, $u_j \in X$, $\|u_j\| = 1$, $(j = 1, \dots, n)$.

Proof. Let $h(x) = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(x))}{l_{u_j}(x)} \right)^{\lambda_j}$. Then $DF(x)\eta = h(x) \left(\eta + \frac{(Dh(x)\eta)x}{h(x)} \right)$, $\eta \in X$. Also

$$\frac{Dh(x)x}{h(x)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \left(\frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)} - 1 \right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)} - 1,$$

where $x_j = l_{u_j}(x)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Since $f_j \in S_g^*$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n$), we have

$$\Re \left[1 + \frac{Dh(x)x}{h(x)} \right] = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \Re \left[\frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)} \right] > 0, \quad x \in B.$$

Therefore, $Dh(x)x + h(x) \neq 0$. It is not difficult to check that

$$(DF(x))^{-1}\eta = \frac{1}{h(x)} \left(\eta - \frac{(Dh(x)\eta)x}{Dh(x)x + h(x)} \right), \quad \eta \in X.$$

So $F(x)$ is a normalized locally biholomorphic mapping on B . Straightforward calculation shows that

$$\frac{\|x\|}{l_x[(DF(x))^{-1}F(x)]} = \frac{Dh(x)x + h(x)}{h(x)x} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)}.$$

On the other hand, since $\frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)} \in g(D)$, and $g(D)$ is convex, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)} \in g(D).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 4. Let $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a convex function which satisfies the conditions of Definition 1. Suppose that $f_j \in S_g^*$, $\lambda_j \geq 0$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$. Then

$$g(-\|z\|) \exp n \int_0^{\|z\|} [g(-y) - 1] \leq |\det J_F(z)| \leq g(\|z\|) \exp n \int_0^{\|z\|} [g(y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y}, \quad (14)$$

where $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)' \in B$, $F(z) = z \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right)^{\lambda_j}$, $\|u_j\| = 1$, $(j = 1, \dots, n)$, B is the unit ball of \mathbb{C}^n with arbitrary norm $\|\cdot\|$, and $J_F(z)$ is the Jacobi matrix of $F(z)$.

Proof. Denote

$$h(z) = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right)^{\lambda_j}, \quad z \in B.$$

Then

$$J_F(z) = h(z) \left(I + z \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \left(\frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} - \frac{1}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right) l_{u_j}(\cdot) \right),$$

where $l_{u_j}(z)$ is a row vector of \mathbb{C}^n . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\det J_F(z)| &= |h(z)|^n \left| 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \left(\frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} - \frac{1}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right) l_{u_j}(z) \right| \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right|^{n\lambda_j} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))l_{u_j}(z)}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

From the maximum (minimum) principle for harmonic functions and the fact that $|l_{u_j}(z)| \leq \|z\|$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$), we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))l_{u_j}(z)}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} \right| \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \Re e \frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))l_{u_j}(z)}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} \geq g(-\|z\|), \quad (15)$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))l_{u_j}(z)}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \left| \frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))l_{u_j}(z)}{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))} \right| \leq g(\|z\|). \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, by Theorems 2 and 3, we have

$$\exp \int_0^{\|z\|} [g(-y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y} \leq \prod_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{f'_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right|^{\lambda_j} \leq \exp \int_0^{\|z\|} [g(y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y}, \quad z \in B. \quad (17)$$

From (15)–(17), the result follows. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2. The estimations of Theorem 4 are sharp. Let $f \in S_g^*$ and F_u be defined by (11) and (12), respectively; we obtain the following equivalent formulation of Theorem 4.

$$\frac{\|z\| \tilde{f}'(\|z\|)}{\tilde{f}(\|z\|)} \exp n \int_0^{\|z\|} \left[\frac{y \tilde{f}'(y)}{\tilde{f}(y)} - 1 \right] \frac{dy}{y} \leq |\det J_F(z)| \leq \frac{\|z\| f'(\|z\|)}{f(\|z\|)} \exp n \int_0^{\|z\|} \left[\frac{y f'(y)}{f(y)} - 1 \right] \frac{dy}{y}$$

for $z \in B$, where $\tilde{f}(\xi) = -f(-\xi)$. Then, we have

$$\frac{\|z\| \tilde{f}'(\|z\|)}{\tilde{f}(\|z\|)} \exp n \left[\log \frac{\tilde{f}(\|z\|)}{\|z\|} - \log \tilde{f}'(0) \right] \leq |\det J_F(z)| \leq \frac{\|z\| f'(\|z\|)}{f(\|z\|)} \exp n \left[\log \frac{f(\|z\|)}{\|z\|} - \log f(0) \right]$$

for $z \in B$, since $\tilde{f}(y), f(y) > 0$ for $y > 0$. We deduce that

$$\frac{-\|z\| f'(-\|z\|)}{f(-\|z\|)} \left(\frac{-f(-\|z\|)}{\|z\|} \right)^n \leq |\det J_F(z)| \leq \frac{\|z\| f'(\|z\|)}{f(\|z\|)} \left(\frac{f(\|z\|)}{\|z\|} \right)^n, \quad z \in B. \quad (18)$$

Taking $z = ru$ or $z = -ru$, then the equalities of the estimations (18) hold for $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_j = 0$ ($j = 2, \dots, n$), and $u_j = u$, $f_j = f$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$). The equivalence of (14) and (18) implies that the estimations (14) are sharp. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 5. Suppose that $f_j \in S_g^*$, $\lambda_j \geq 0$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$. Then

$$\|x\| g(-\|x\|) \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} [g(-y) - 1] \leq \|DF(x)x\| \leq \|x\| g(\|x\|) \exp \int_0^{\|x\|} [g(y) - 1] \frac{dy}{y}, \quad x \in B,$$

where $F(x) = x \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(x))}{l_{u_j}(x)} \right)^{\lambda_j}$, $u_j \in B$, and $\|u_j\| = 1$, ($j = 1, \dots, n$).

Proof. Denote

$$h(x) = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(x))}{l_{u_j}(x)} \right)^{\lambda_j}, \quad x \in B.$$

Straightforward computation shows that

$$DF(x)x = h(x)x + (Dh(x)x)x = x \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(x_j)}{x_j} \right)^{\lambda_j} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \frac{f'_j(x_j)x_j}{f_j(x_j)}, \quad (19)$$

where $x_j = l_{u_j}(x)$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$).

From (15)–(17) and (19), we have the desired result. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3. The estimations of Theorem 5 are sharp. The proof of sharpness is similar to that of Theorem 4, so we omit it.

For $g(\zeta) = \frac{1+(2\alpha-1)\zeta}{1+\zeta}$, $\zeta \in D$, from Theorems 4 and 5, we obtain the following corollaries.

Corollary 1. Suppose that $f_j \in S_\alpha^*$ ($0 \leq \alpha < 1$), $\lambda_j \geq 0$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$), and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$. Then

$$\frac{1 - (1 - 2\alpha)\|z\|}{(1 + \|z\|)^{1+2(1-\alpha)n}} \leq |\det J_F(z)| \leq \frac{1 + (1 - 2\alpha)\|z\|}{(1 - \|z\|)^{1+2(1-\alpha)n}}, \quad (20)$$

where $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)' \in B$, $F(z) = z \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(z))}{l_{u_j}(z)} \right)^{\lambda_j}$, $\|u_j\| = 1$, ($j = 1, \dots, n$), B is the unit ball of \mathbb{C}^n with arbitrary norm $\|\cdot\|$, and $J_F(z)$ is the Jacobi matrix of $F(z)$. These estimations are sharp.

Corollary 2. Suppose that $f_j \in S_\alpha^*$ ($0 \leq \alpha < 1$), $\lambda_j \geq 0$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$), and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$. Then

$$\frac{(1 - (1 - 2\alpha)\|x\|)\|x\|}{(1 + \|x\|)^{3-2\alpha}} \leq \|DF(x)x\| \leq \frac{(1 + (1 - 2\alpha)\|x\|)\|x\|}{(1 - \|x\|)^{3-2\alpha}}, \quad x \in B \quad (21)$$

where $F(x) = x \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{f_j(l_{u_j}(x))}{l_{u_j}(x)} \right)^{\lambda_j}$, $\|u_j\| = 1$, ($j = 1, \dots, n$). These estimations are sharp.

Remark 4. When $n = 1$, $B = D$, Corollaries 1 and 2 are the same as Theorem B.

References

- [1] C. Pommerenke, Univalent Functions, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1975.
- [2] H. Cartan, Sur la possibilité d'étendre aux fonctions de plusieurs variables complex, La théorie des fonctions univalentes, in: Paul Montel (Ed.), Leçons sur les Fonctions Univalentes ou Multivalentes, GauthierVillars, Paris, 1933, pp. 125–155.
- [3] R.W. Barnard, C.H. FitzGerald, S. Gong, The growth and (1/4)-theorems for starlike mappings in \mathbb{C}^n , Pacific J. Math. 150 (1991) 13–22.
- [4] M. Chuaqui, Applications of subordination chains to starlike mappings in \mathbb{C}^n , Pacific J. Math. 168 (1995) 33–48.
- [5] G. Kohr, On starlikeness and strongly starlikeness of order α in \mathbb{C}^n , Mathematica (Cluj) 40 (63) (1998) 95–109.
- [6] T. Liu, X. Liu, On the precise growth, covering and distortion theorem for normalized biholomorphic mappings, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 295 (2004) 404–417.
- [7] H. Hamada, T. Honda, Sharp growth theorems and coefficient bounds for starlike mappings in several complex variables, Chin. Ann. Math. 29 B (4) (2008) 353–368.
- [8] H. Hamada, T. Honda, G. Kohr, Growth theorems and coefficient bounds for univalent holomorphic mappings which have parametric representation, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 317 (2006) 302–319.
- [9] J.A. Pfaltzgraff, T.J. Suffridge, An extension theorem and linear invariant families generated by starlike maps, Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie Skłodowska, Sect. A. 53 (1999) 193–207.
- [10] I. Graham, G. Kohr, Geometric Function Theory in One and Higher Dimensions, Marcel Dekker, New York, 2003.
- [11] I. Graham, H. Hamada, G. Kohr, Parametric representation of univalent mappings in several complex variables, Canad. J. Math. 54 (2) (2002) 324–351.
- [12] G. Kohr, Using the method of Löwner chains to introduce some subclasses of biholomorphic mappings in \mathbb{C}^n , Rev. Roum. Math. Pures Appl. 46 (2001) 743–760.
- [13] T. Kato, Nonlinear semigroups and evolution equations, J. Math. Soc. Japan 19 (1967) 508–520.
- [14] W.J. Zhang, D.Z. Dong, The growth and (1/4)-theorems for starlike mappings in a Banach space, Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. A. 13 (1992) 417–423.